Status of the Claims

Claims 1-8, 10-24, and 26-32 are now pending in the present application, Claims 1 and 17 having been amended to more clearly distinguish applicants' claimed subject matter over the cited art, and Claims 9 and 25 having been canceled because their recitation is generally subsumed in previously amended Claims 1 and 17.

Brief Summary of Telephone Interview

On May 17, 2006, applicants' attorney discussed the current Office Action with Examiner Nguyen during a telephone interview. The discussion focused on applicants' recitation of receiving personal information from a user, wherein the personal information includes at least one of the user's surname, given name, address, set of initials, telephone number and firm name in the first step of independent Claim 1, over the cited Hayes reference. Hayes is directed towards a client-server system for maintaining a user desktop, consistent with server application user access permissions.

Applicants' attorney appreciates Examiner Nguyen's willingness to explain her position in applying the references to reject applicants' claims and to move the prosecution of the case forward. During the interview, applicants' attorney asked Examiner Nguyen to indicate where Hayes specifically teaches the use of personal information that includes at least one of the six items recited in Claim 1. Examiner Nguyen indicated that this personal information feature lacks novelty. She indicated that including personal information as recited by applicants' claims is well known in the art. She also indicated that column 6, lines 63-64 of Hayes discloses a client profile management that includes Log-on support, and that this support includes mapping to a user profile. The Examiner also stated that it is inherent that user profiles include personal information as recited by applicants' claims.

Although noting that a prior art reference has not been cited that specifically teaches what is recited in Claims 1 and 17, applicants' attorney asked Examiner Nguyen if she had any suggestions for amending the claims to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference. Examiner Nguyen indicated that in light of applicants' preamble that the technique being claimed is directed towards a method for utilizing personal information to customize an application program, distinguishing language providing a better definition of the application program might help, for example, as recited in dependent Claim 14. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment might help to provide a basis for showing that the claim recitation defines a novel approach because it would distinguish independent Claim 1 from appearing to read on a server. Also,

another possibility discussed was the inclusion of distinguishing language directed towards the customization of an output of the application program, as recited in the last step. Examiner Nguyen also indicated that in order to move the case forward, she would be willing to telephone applicants' attorney after she reviews the amendment and Office Action response, if it appears that additional clarifying language might be added to make the claims allowable.

Applicants' attorney would like to again thank Examiner Nguyen for her time and willingness to discuss these issues during the telephone interview.

Amendment to the Specification

The specification has been amended, under the BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS, to add a description of FIG. 9 and FIG. 10. Since the added language is substantially as recited in the discussion of these two Figures in the main body of the specification as filed (i.e., under the DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EMBODIMENTS, on page 18, lines 18-21, and page 20, lines 14-17), it will be apparent that the amendment does NOT add any new matter.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-29 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hayes et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,339,826 ("Hayes") further in view of Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,868,448 (hereinafter referred to as "Gupta"). Claims 6, 14, 22, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/1200496 Alfred et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Alfred"). Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections because, as explained below, the cited art in combination does not teach or suggest all of the recitation in these claims, particularly in view of the amendments to Claims 1 and 17.

In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this response, the following discussion focuses on amended independent Claims 1 and 17. The patentability of each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's conclusion that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited reference. Similarly, applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish

over the references cited. Moreover, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

<u>Patentability of Independent Claim 1</u>

A significant difference exists between Hayes and the recitation of applicants' independent Claim 1 because Hayes does not teach or suggest customizing an application program output *by including at least a portion of the personal information within the output*. In its entirety, applicants' last step of independent Claim 17 recites (with emphasis added):

> upon identifying the unique user identity applicable to execution of an application program that is included in the plurality of application programs, sharing the personal information corresponding with the unique user identity with the application program, wherein the personal information is applied to customize an output of the application program *by including at least a portion of the personal information within the output of the application program*.

For example, applicants' FIGURES 6 and 7 illustrate methods for utilizing personal information to customize a user's experience. FIGURE 6's accompanying disclosure explains how user interface 600 includes tabs 602-610, and each tab can contain one or more text fields 614-630 with a user's personal information 632. For example, author field 618 within the summary tab 604 is personal information 632 such as "Kilpatrick Stockton" (a first and last name), which can be provided by entering personal information into a user interface, as shown in FIGURE 3 at user interface 300 (applicants' specification, page 15, line 32-page 16, line 7). Thus, FIGURE 6 and its accompanying disclosure illustrate how the output of the application program (i.e., a properties page for a word processing program) has been customized because at least a portion of the personal information (i.e., a firm name) has been included in the output (a properties page) as a result of that personal information being entered into user interface 300 and shared.

FIGURE 7's accompanying disclosure explains how a user preferences window can include one or more tabs 702, wherein each tab 702 includes one or more fields 704 (see applicants' specification, page 16, line 15-23). An application program 202 has utilized a user's personal information received from the framework identity database 200 to complete the application program's user preferences window. For example, a user's personal information 706 such as work company "Magicians, Inc.," address "1300 Houdini Lane," and phone number "101-555-1211" appears in user interface 700. Thus, FIGURE 7 and its accompanying disclosure illustrate how an output of an application program (i.e., a user preferences window

of a word processing program) has been customized because at least a portion of the personal information previously provided (i.e., work company, address, and phone number) has been included in the output. This personal information was available in the framework identity database 200 such that it could be received from the framework identity database 200 (see applicants' specification, page 16, lines 18-19).

FIGURE 7's accompanying disclosure also explains how a user's personal information 706 may be entered into user interface 700. In this case, the user interface sends the personal information via the application program 202 to the framework identity database 200, wherein an existing user record 208 is modified or created (applicants' specification, page 16, lines 24-30). And, as apparent from FIGURE 9, step 914, this user record of personal information is then shared with specific application programs. It follows then that the output of the application program (such as features, commands, documents, templates, and other similar output (see applicants' specification, page 3, lines 16-17)) have been customized because at least a portion of the personal information (the user's personal information 706 that was entered by a user into user interface 700) has been included in the output (features, commands, documents, templates, and other similar output) of an application program that is being utilized. Please note that output is not limited to a visual display.

In contrast, Hayes does NOT customize an output of the application program by including at least a portion of the personal information within the output. Instead, Hayes simply employs a user's log-on identifier to provide a list of applications for which the user has access permission (Hayes, Abstract). Providing a list of applications does not correspond to use of at least a portion of personal information in an output of an application program.

The Examiner has indicated that applicants' claim recitation "...the personal information is applied to an output of the application program" could be given a broad and reasonable interpretation as sending/outputting the application program according to the user information. The Examiner further indicates that Hayes teaches upon receiving the request from the client (user), the server sends/downloads (i.e., output) a list of applications to which the user has access permission according to the user's preferences/profiles (page 2, Final Office Action dated May 19, 2005). Further, Hayes' *list* of applications is NOT equivalent to the applicants' recitation that: "*application program's output that is customized by including at least a portion of the personal information within the output of the application program.*" There is no teaching in Hayes that any of these applications included in the list includes personal information within them or provides an output that includes any portion of such information. Thus,

applicants maintain that Hayes does not teach or suggest customizing an application program output *by including at least a portion of the personal information within the output of the application program.* Since the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claim recitation of independent Claim 1, the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 17

Independent Claim 17 recites a computer system for utilizing personal information to customize an application program and is generally analogous to independent method Claim 1. Claim 17 has also been amended in the same way as Claim 1. For the reasons discussed above in regard to independent Claim 1, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claim recitation of independent Claim 17. Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the elements of the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, and because Hayes and Gupta do not disclose or suggest all of the steps and elements respectively of independent Claims 1 and 17, the rejection of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-13, 15-16, 18-21, 23-29, and 31-32, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hayes and Gupta should also be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

In addition, Claims 6 and 14 depend from independent Claim 1, which is patentable for the reasons discussed above. Similarly, Claims 22 and 30 depend from independent Claim 17, which also is patentable for the reasons discussed above. Because dependent claims are considered to include all of the steps or elements of the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend, dependent Claims 6 and 14, and 22 and 30 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to independent Claims 1 and 17.

In view of the Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims in this application define a novel and non-obvious invention, and that the application is in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay. Should any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/sabrina macintyre/
Sabrina K. MacIntyre
Registration No. 56,912

SKM/RMA:elm